

WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3960

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR FILING DATE ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/603,628 06/26/2003 Wolfgang Diemer 440757/PALL 3381 23548 7590 10/18/2005 EXAMINER LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD CINTINS, IVARS C 700 THIRTEENTH ST. NW ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER SUITE 300

1724

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/603,628	DIEMER ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Ivars C. Cintins	1724

		7			
	Ivars C. Cintins	1724			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 30 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. 					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).					
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
7. Solution For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) solution will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-8,11, 17 and 19-24.</u>					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 9,10,12-16 and 18.					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
13. Souther: See Continuation Sheet.					
		lvas C. Cintins	lins		

Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1724

Continuation of 13. Other: With regard to Applicant's remarks contained in the response filed September 30, 2005, it is pointed out that the removed solids in the WO '555 system will inherently produce a layer containing interstitial spaces, and these interstitial spaces are inherently capable of preventing passage (i.e. filtering) of particles larger than these spaces. It is also pointed out that the filter module of this reference is capable of filtering both liquids and gases; and if gases are filtered by this device, then the separated solids retained in the filter cells (9) would be dry. Furthermore, even if this device is employed to filter an aqueous liquid, the removed solids permenantly retained in the filter cells of this device (see the last sentence of the abstract) would eventually dry out, and at this point the "treatment material" in these cells would be dry, as now recited in claims 1 and 17.